

## REMARKS

In accordance with the foregoing, the abstract is amended. No new matter is presented in any of the foregoing and, accordingly, approval and entry of the amended abstract are respectfully requested. Claims 1, 3, 7, 9, 11, 13, 17, 19 and 23 are cancelled without prejudice or disclaimer.

Claims 4, 6, 8, 10, 14, 16, 20-22, and 24-27 are pending and under consideration.

### **Statement On Substance Of Interview**

An in-person interview between the Applicants' representative and the Examiner was conducted on August 23, 2006. Applicants thank the Examiner for the opportunity to conduct the in-person interview.

The substance of the interview included discussion of features of the present invention that patentably distinguish over the cited art.

Further, the Examiner indicated that independent claim 8 is allowable (see Interview Summary) particularly for the recitation of "data perpetuation object."

### **Item 3: Objection To Specification**

In item 3 of the Office Action, the Examiner objects to the specification because of an informality in the Abstract. The Abstract is amended herein as suggested by the Examiner. Withdrawal of the objection is requested.

### **Item 4: Rejection of claims 4, 6, 8, 10, 14, 16, 20-22, and 24-27 under 35 U.S.C. §102(b)**

In item 4 of the Office Action, the Examiner rejects independent claims 4, 8, 10, 14, 20, and 24 (and respective dependent claims 6, 16, 21-22, and 25-27) under 35 U.S.C. §102(b) as being anticipated by Materna et al. (U.S.P. 4,714,995)

As discussed during the in-person interview, the Examiner indicated that independent claim 8 is allowable, in particular because of the feature of "data perpetuation object."

The rejection is traversed. Applicants submit that each of independent claims 4, 10, 14, 20, and 24 (in addition to claim 8) recite such a "data perpetuation object" in addition to other features that patentably distinguish over the cited art.

Independent claim 4 recites "a data perpetuation object apparatus . . . the apparatus being implemented as an object to be operated singly, and comprising: . . . role object generating means that generates a role object as an active role with respect to information processing means that is a data transmission origin, and a role object as a passive role with respect to information processing means that is a data transmission destination; and relating

object generating means for referring to the collaboration information of the collaboration information storage means and generating a relating object for transmitting information to be stored in a storage apparatus of each information processing means between the role objects. (emphasis added)."

Independent claim 14 recites "a method of performing unified management of data managed in duplicate by a plurality of information processors based on different architecture, the method being carried out by a perpetuation object to be operated singly, and comprising: . . . referring to collaboration information including information on a communication method between the information processors and generating a role object as an active role with respect to an information processor that is a data transmission origin, and a role object as a passive role with respect to an information processor that is a data transmission destination; and referring to the stored collaboration information and generating a relating object (emphasis added)."

Independent claim 24 recites a integrated information processing system integrating a plurality of information processors each having a storage including a collaboration information storage that stores collaboration information on a communication method between the information processors; and a data perpetuation object apparatus that refers to the stored collaboration information and performs a unified management of the data managed by the information processors (emphasis added).

In the Office Action, the Examiner cites Materna col. 7, line 16 as teaching "generating an information identification object that determines information to be stored in a storage apparatus of each information processing means."

As discussed during the in-person interview, Applicants respectfully submit that the capture module 31 discussed by Materna, in the lines cited by the Examiner, does not teach such a "generating an information identification object that determines information to be stored in a storage apparatus of each information processing means." Rather, Materna merely teaches (see, for example, col. 6, lines 31-33) that such a generating is provided on the information processing means (database) side to be collaborated.

That is, Materna does not teach that such a generating is present in the "data perpetuation object apparatus being implemented to be operated singly" as recited by claims according to an aspect of the present invention.

Furthermore, the capture module 31 of Materna does not have a function of generating an object.

As also discussed during the interview, Applicants respectfully submit that the Examiner's contention that the integration engine 20 of Materna corresponds to the collaboration apparatus between information processing systems or the data perpetuation object apparatus of the present invention is not correct.

That is, the integration engine 20 of Materna does not teach a collaboration apparatus between information processing systems or the data perpetuation object apparatus of the present invention which has a function of dynamically generating objects such as "a role object as an active role", "a role object as a passive role", "a relating object", and "an information identification object".

### Summary

Since features recited by independent claims independent claims 4, 8, 10, 14, 20, and 24 (and respective dependent claims 6, 16, 21-22, and 25-27) are not taught by Materna, the rejection should be withdrawn and claims 4, 6, 8, 10, 14, 16, 20-22, and 24-27 allowed.

### CONCLUSION

There being no further outstanding objections or rejections, it is submitted that the application is in condition for allowance. An early action to that effect is courteously solicited.

Finally, if there are any formal matters remaining after this response, the Examiner is requested to telephone the undersigned to attend to these matters.

If there are any additional fees associated with filing of this Amendment, please charge the same to our Deposit Account No. 19-3935.

Respectfully submitted,

STAAS & HALSEY LLP

Date: September 5, 2005

By: Paul W. Bobowec  
Paul W. Bobowec  
Registration No. 47,431

1201 New York Avenue, NW, 7th Floor  
Washington, D.C. 20005  
Telephone: (202) 434-1500  
Facsimile: (202) 434-1501